

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 are rejected. In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended and new claim 21 is added. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Office Action objects to the specification because "the computer readable medium recited in claims 14-18 is not mentioned in the Specification and is therefore not supported."

MPEP § 608.01(I) recites in part:

In establishing a disclosure, applicant may rely not only on the description and drawing as filed but ***also on the original claims*** if their content justifies it.

The original claims recite "computer readable medium." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the application specification adequately discloses the claimed "computer readable medium."

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objects to claims 2, 7, 8, 12 and 18 as containing informalities. In accordance with the foregoing claims 2, 8, 12 and 18 are amended, taking into consideration the comments and suggestions of the Examiner. With respect to claim 7, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that "data" and "information" are synonymous. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-8 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In accordance with the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 19 are amended. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-8 and 19 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, as discussed above, the original specification supports the claimed "computer readable medium." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14-18 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moraes et al. (US patent Pub. No. 2005/0033777) (Moraes).

The cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed embodiments.

Claims 1-8 Define over the Cited Art

Consider claim 1, which recites in part:

an analyzer to calculate an analytical result using at least one data entity stored in a database;

...

a correction server that, when corrections are made to the database, identifies corrected entities in a corrected entity log and compares the corrected entity log against the read history ***to identify analytical results rendered possibly inconsistent due to the correction***

Moraes fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, a "correction server ... to identify analytical results rendered possibly inconsistent due to the correction," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action relies upon the "observer module" discussed in Moraes at paragraph [0054] and [0102] to disclose the claimed feature. Moraes, at paragraph [0054] recites in part: "The observer module 602 is used to observe ***initial baseline values of the set of data items that the change tracer 300 is attentive to.***" That is, the "observer module" of Moraes monitors the data values for a plurality of data items. However, there is no evidence that the observer module does anything other than observe the data items. Accordingly, the observer module of Moraes fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "***an analyzer to calculate an analytical result*** using at least one data entity stored in a database," because there is no evidence that the observer module calculates an analytical result using the data items, rather the observer module merely observes the data items.

Further, Moraes at paragraph [0102] recites in part:

If the observer module is not presently performing a baseline run, then control moves to step 11-4, which checks if the information about the current Item in the DBDir list is the same as the information obtained in step 11-1 from the operating system. If this information is identical, then execution skips ahead to step 11-6. ***If the information is not identical, a change has been detected and execution proceeds to step 11-5, in which an "Item Changed" message is sent*** to the session module along with the new information that was obtained from the operating system in step 11-1.

In other words, Moraes discusses that the observer module determines if the "Item" (the "data item" discussed above") has changed since the baseline run was performed. Accordingly, there is no evidence that Moraes discloses the claimed "a correction server that ... ***to identify analytical results rendered possibly inconsistent due to the correction,***" because Moraes merely discusses observing if a data item has been change. That it, Moraes merely observes if a "data item" has changed and does not disclose identifying if an analytical result calculated based upon the data item is "rendered possibly inconsistent due to the correction" of the data item.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Dependent claims 2-8 refer to independent claim 1, and therefore patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Claims 9-13 Define over the Cited Art

Consider claim 9, which is amended to recite in part:

comparing the corrected entity log entry against a read history log identifying ***whether entities in the database have been used to calculate an analytical result,***

if the entry matches an entry from the read history log, ***identifying a dependent database entity from the read history log as a possibly inconsistent entity, the dependent database entity storing the analytical result calculated from the first database entity***

As discussed above, Moraes fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "identifying a dependent database entity from the read history log as a possibly inconsistent entity, the dependent database entity storing the analytical result calculated from the first database entity," because Moraes merely discusses observing if a data item has been changed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-13 is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-18 Define over the Cited Art

Consider claim 14, which is amended to recite in part:

compare the corrected entity log entry against a read history log identifying ***whether entities in the in the database have been used to calculate an analytical result,***

if the entry matches an entry from the read history log, ***identify a dependent database entity from the read history log as a possibly inconsistent entity, the dependent database entity storing an analytical result calculated from the first database entity***

As discussed above, Moraes fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "identifying a dependent database entity from the read history log as a possibly inconsistent entity, the dependent database entity storing the analytical result calculated from the first database entity," because Moraes merely discusses observing if a data item has been changed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14-18 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 Defines over the Cited Art

Consider claim 19, which is amended to recite in part:

a ***third database*** to store a list of uncorrected data entries identified as ***potentially inconsistent due to a correction performed on an entity listed in the second database;*** and
a data flow manager to manage access to the first database, the second database, and the third database by an analyzer, ***the analyzer to provide analytical results calculated from data stored in the first database to an operator of the system and storing the analytical results in the third database***

As discussed above, Moraes fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "a third database to store a list of uncorrected data entries identified as potentially inconsistent due to a correction performed on an entity listed in the second database; and a data flow manager to manage access to the first database, the second database, and the third database by an analyzer, the analyzer to provide analytical results calculated from data stored in the first database to an operator of the system and storing the analytical results in the third database" because Moraes merely discusses observing if a data item has been changed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 21 is related to a correction server system, including.

an analyzer to ***calculate an analytical result using a plurality of data entries*** stored in a database;
a data flow manager logging requests to retrieve data entries from the database, logging requests to store data entries in the database, and identifying which of

the plurality of entries in the database were used to calculate the analytical result, in a memory device, and
a correction server that, ***when a data entry used to calculated the analytical result has been changed, identifies analytical results rendered possibly inconsistent due to the correction***

Support for the new claim can be found, for example, in FIG. 1 and the corresponding discussion in the application. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose the features of new claim 21.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition, and earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4420 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 24, 2009

/Matthew H. Polson/
Matthew H. Polson
Registration No. 58,841

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201